

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03154 01 OF 02 061952Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 DODE-00

NSC-05 BIB-01 /089 W

----- 081613

R 061833Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SCSTATE WASHDC 2197

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3154

E.O. 11652:GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: AHG BRIEFING OF THE NAC ON JUNE 6

REF: A. MBFR VIENNA 255

B. USNATO 1555 DTG 201735Z MAR 75

C. USNATO 1705 271720Z MAR 75

SUMMARY: NAC RECEIVED REGULAR BRIEFING BY AHG REPS ON JUNE 6. AMBASSA-  
DOR

ROSE (UK )) WAS THE PRINCIPAL AHG SPOKESMAN, ASSISTED BY ITALIAN DEP  
REP

TALIANI. MOST PROMINENT ISSUE IN THE DISCUSSION WAS THE COMING AHG  
REQUEST FOR NAC GUIDANCE ON ANSWERING EASTERN QUESTIONS ABOUT  
WHETHER, ASSUMING CONCLUSION OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT, EACH NON-U.S.  
ALLY WOULD BE WILLING TO UNDERTAKE SPECIFIC COMMITMENTS RE  
AMONT AND TIMING OF ITS REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II. DRAPF(FRG) INDI-  
CATED FRG CAUTIONON THIS ISSUE, WHILE DE STAERCKE (BELGIUM) AND  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03154 01 OF 02 061952Z

HARTGH (NETHERLANDS) WELCOMED THE AHG  
REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE. OTHER ISSUES DISCUSSED WERE USE OF DATA,  
RELATIONSHIP OF CSCE TO MBFR, AND LANK SECURITY. END SUMMARY.

1. ACTING SYG PANSA BEGAN THE DISCUSSION BY UNDERLINING ALLIED COHESION ON MBFR DESPITE THE LACK OF PROGRESS IN THE NEGOTIATION. HE SAID AN IMPORTANT REASON FOR THIS WAS THE GOOD FUNCTIONING OF THE NAC AS A AGREED BODY FOR ENSURING CONSULTATIONS ON MBFR POLICY. HE NOTED THAT THE NAC TURNS TO THE SPC FOR ASSISTANCE IN DRAFTING GUIDANCE TO AHG, AND EMPLOYES THE MBFR WG FOR ADVICE WHEN NEEDED ON MILITARY-TECHNICAL QUESTIONS. (COMMENT: WE UNDERSTAND PANSA INTENDED THIS AS A REMINDER OF THE AGREED ALLIED CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURE ON MBFR IN VIEW OF MC CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS ON TION# III AT SUMMIT AND AT JUNE 5 MC MEETING, WHICH IS REPORTED SEPTEL).

2. ROSE IN HIS STATEMENT, FOLLOWED THE TEXT IN REF A VERY CLOSELY, EXCEPT FOR AN ADDITION HE MADE AT THE END OF PARA 8(II). HE STATED AT THAT POINT THAT THE AHG BELIEVED IT IMPORTANT THAT STUDIES OF THE DATA PROBLEM UNDER WAY IN THE ALLIANCE BE CONTINUED, WITH THE OBJECT OF CONSIDERING THE DATA ITSELF, AND WHAT SORT OF RESPONSES SHOULD THE ALLIES MAKE ON DATA TO THE EAST.

3. REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II. KRAPF (FRG) SAID HE WISHED TO COMMENT ON THE COMING AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II. HE SAID FRG RECOGNIZES THAT AMV IS IN AN UNCOMFORTABLE POSITION, AND RESPECTS THE WAY IT HAS RESISTED PRESSURE FROM THE OTHER SIDE. HE NOTED THAT A REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II WAS OF PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE TO A NUMBER OF ALLIED GOVERNMENTS, AND WOULD NEED CAREFUL INTEREST. THE LATEST NAC GUIDANCE TO AHG IS IN FACT ON THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING, SO ALLIED DECISION-MAKING ON THIS QUESTION IS UP TO DATE. HE RECALLED THAT ON ALLY HAD SOUGHT TO MODIFY ONE ELEMENT OF THE COMMON CEILING, BUT THIS DID NOT FIND SUPPORT, AND WAS DELIBERATELY OMITTED FROM THE APRIL 16 NAC GUIDANCE. (COMMENT: KRAPF WAS REFERRING TO BELGIAN PROPOSAL THAT PRIOR TO SIGNATURE OF THE PHASE II AGREEMENT, HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

OF EACH PARTY INFORM EACH HEAD OF DELEGATION ON THE OTHER SIDE, BY LETTER, OF THE APPORTIONMENT OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS WHICH THE GOVERNMENTS ON HIS SIDE HAVE AGREED AMONG THEMSELVES... PARA 3, SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03154 01 OF 02 061952Z

REF B. FRG OPPOSED THIS IDEA AS "EXTREMELY DANGEROUS..." (REF C).

4. ROSE REPLIED THAT THERE ARE TWO SEPARATE QUESTIONS HERE. ONE IS THE END GOAL, I.E. THE COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING, WHICH WAS THE SUBJECT OF THE NAC GUIDANCE OF APRIL 16. THE PRESENT QUESTION IS HOW TO ANSWER EASTERN QUESTIONS OR WHETHER THE ALLIES ARE WILLING TO UNDERTAKE SPECIFIC PHASE II COMMITMENTS IN THE EVENT OF A PHASE I AGREEMENT. THE EAST INSISTS THAT UNTIL IT KNOWS THE SPECIFIC ALLIED REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II, THE EAST IS NOT READY TO CONSIDER EASTERN REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I. ROSE SAID THAT THERE IS NO ALLIED AGREEMENT ON THE FORM IN WHICH PHASE II REDUCTION COMMITMENTS WILL BE EXPRESSED. PERHAPS THE ONLY ANSWER TO THE

EAST IS THAT THIS IS A QUEESTION TO BE RESOLVED AT A LATER DATE.  
HOWEVER, THIS IS NOT A POSITION AGREED BY THE ALLIES.

5. DE STAERCKE (BELGIUM) SAID HE AGREED THAT THE AHG NEEDED AN  
ANSWER TO THE QUESTIONS IT WILL RAIS E ABOUT REDUCTIO COMMITMENTS  
IN PHASE II. HE RECALLED THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL,WHICH HAD TOUCHED ON  
THIS ISSUE, AND HAD NOT BEEN ACCEPTED IN THE NAC GUIDANCE OF APRIL  
16.

6. ROSE STRESSED THAT THE AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE WOULD NOT CONCERN  
THE COMMON CEILING AS AN END GOAL BUT RUATHER HOW THE ALLIES  
WWOULD EXPRESS THE ALL PARTICIPANTS COMMITMENT WITH RESPECT O  
REDJCTIONS IN PHASE II.THIS LATTER QUESTION SHOULD IN NO WAY  
PREJUDICE THE COLLECTIVE NATURE OF THE COMMON CEILING, AND THE  
ALLIED POSITION AGAINST NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS.

7.HARTOGH (NETHERLANDS) THOUGHT THAT THE EAST WAS PROBABLY RIGHT  
IN THINKING THAT THE ALLIES WERE VULNERABLE REGARDING THE QUESTION  
OF REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II. THE NAC SHOULD REPLY  
PORITIVELY AND RAPIDLY TO THE AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT.

8. ROSE POINTED OUT THAT AT THE LAST INFORMAL MEETING, KHLESTOV  
HAD AVOIDED ANSWERING REPEATED QUESTIONS FROM THE CANADAIAN REP  
ON WHETHER,IF THE ALLIES WERE WILLING TO OFFER SPECIFIC INDIVIDUAL  
COMMITMENTS FOR REDUCTIOS IN PHASE II,THE EAST WOULD ACCEPT  
THE COMMON CEILING.

9 SVART (DENMARK) THOUGHT THAT THE ALLIED POSITION ON THIS POINT  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03154 01 OF 02 061952Z

WAS NOT AS VULNERABLE AS MUCH OF THE DISCUSSION HAD SEEMED TO  
INDICATE. THE ALL PARTICIPANTS COMMITMENT,COUPLEDWITH THE  
CANADAIN QUESTION IN THE PRECEDING PARAGRAPH,SHOULD ENABLE THE  
ALLIES TO MAINTAIN A GOOD POSITION FOR A CONSIDERABLE TIME.

NOTE BY OC/T: #AS RECEIVED.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03154 02 OF 02 062005Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 DODE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 ISO-00 /089 W

----- 081832

R 061833Z JUN 75  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO RUEHCSECSTATE WASHDC 2198  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3154

10. PANSA SAID THAT THE NAC WOULD, UPON RECEIPT OF THE AHG REQUEST FOR GUIDANCE O THIS SUBJECT,ASK THE SPC TO PROCESS IT. HE ASKED THAT THE AHG, IN ITS REQUEST,INDICATE ITS VIEW ON TIMING.

11. USE OF DATA.KRAPF ALSO SAID HE WAS STRUCK BY AHG PESSIMISM REGARDING THE ALLIED STANCE ON DATA.HE ASKED WHY THE AHG THOUGHT THAT EASTERN WEAKNESS, REGARDING THE ALLIED OFFER OF A DATA EXCHANGE, WAS ONLY SHORT-TERM (PARA 8II,REF A). ROSE REPLIED THAT THE EAST HAS NEVER REFUSED A DATA EXCHANGE, BUT ONLY SAID THAT THE TIME WAS NOT RIGHT. THE EAST COULD WELL ASK IF THE WEST WOULD BE PREPARED AT THE PROPER TIME TO DISCUSS DATA FOR BOTH FORCES AND EQUIPMENT. IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE TO GIVE A POSITIVE RESPONSE TO SUCH A QUESTION. THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT EQUIVOVATE. ROSE,IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION FROM PANSA, SAID THAT THE COMING AHG REQUEST FOR NAC GUIDANCE WOLD CONCERN REDUCTION COMMITMENTS IN PHASE II, AND NOT DATA ISSUES.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03154 02 OF 02 062005Z

12. CSCE AND MBFR. DE STAERCKE SAID THAT AFTER CONCLUSION OF CSCE,THE ALLIES WILL HAVE TO KNOW WHERE THEYARE GOING ON MBFR. THEY WILL NEED TO SHO DYNAMISM IN THE LATTER NEGOTIATION. IN CON THIS CONNECTION, THE QUESTION IS HOW TO RECONCILE THE NUNN AMENDMENT WITH AN ALLIED POSITION ON OPTION III.ERALP (TURKEY) ASKED FOR CURRENT AHG VIEW ON CONNECTION EAST MAKES BETWEEN CSCE AND MBFR.

13. ROSE REITERATED AHG VIEW THAT UNTIL THERE ARE RESULTS IN CSCE, THE UAST WILL BIDE ITS TIME IN MBFR, BUT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT THE EAST WILL DO ANYTHING EVEN THEN IN MBFR UNLESS EVIDENCE THAT THE EAST WILL DO ANYTHING EVEN THEN IN MBFR UNLESS THE ALLIES MAKE SOME NEW INITIATIVE. TALIANI AGREED, AND SAID THAT PERHAPS THE OTHER SIDE WILL WANT TO AWAIT CONCLUSION OF SALT ALSO.

14. MENZIES (CANADA)NOTED THAT THE QUESTION OF POST-CSCE EXPECTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC IS NOW UNDER STUDY IN THE SPC. PERHAPS MORE THOUGHT SHOULD BE GIVEN IN THIS STUDY TO MBFR ASPECTS. HE

THOUGHT THAT IN CONSIDERING THE ADDITION OF NEW ELEMENTS TO THE ALLIED MBFR POSITION, THE ALLIES SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT NOT ONLY NEGOTIATING FACTORS, BUT ALSO POST-CSCE PUBLIC OPINION. HE ASKED FOR ROSE'S COMMENT ON THIS, AND ALSO ON WHETHER THERE HAD BEEN ANY REACTION BY THE EAST TO TREATMENT OF MBFR IN THE SUMMIT COMMUNIQUE.

15. ASSISTANT SYG KASTL NOTED THE GENERAL VIEW IN SPC THAT MBFR SHOULD FIGURE STRONGLY IN THE SPC REPORT ON PUBLIC INFORMATION ASPECTS ON CSCE. IT IS NECESSARY TO TAKE FRENCH VIEWS INTO ACCOUNT. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF THE OTHER 14 FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT THE MATTER, PERHAPS THE 14 WOULD AGREE ON A REPORT.

16. ROSE SAID IT WOULD BE WRONG TO DECIDE ALLIANCE POLICY ON MBFR SIMPLY FOR PUBLIC OPINION REASONS. HOWEVER, AFTER CSCE THE ALLIES MIGHT COME UNDER GREATER FIRE, WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC OPINION, ESPECIALLY IF THE EAST PRESSES ITS CASE PUBLICLY, WHICH THEY HAVE NOT REALLY DONE UP TO NOW. RE EASTERN REACTION TO THE SUMMIT COMMUNIQUE, THE ONLY REACTION SO FAR WAS THAT THE POLICH REP AT JUN 5 PLENARY SESSION REFERRED TO THE MESSAGE EMANATING FROM RECENT NATO MEETINGS AS  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03154 02 OF 02 062005Z

REINFORCING EASTERN CONCERN ABOUT UNWILLINGNESS OF NON-U.S. ALLIES TO COMMIT THEMSELVES TO SPECIFIC DEDUCTIONS IN PHASE II.

17. HARTOGH SAID THAT PROGRESS IN MBFR AFTER CSCE WILL DEPEND ON SOME MOVE FROM THE WEST. THE EAST HAS MADE IT CLEAR THAT IT IS EXPECTING A CERTAIN NEW APPROACH FROM THE ALLIES. IT IS NECESSARY TO STUDY WHETHER THAT APPROACH IS POSSIBLE WITH THE GREATEST SPEED.

18. FLANK SECURITY. ERALP SAID HE WANTED TO REPEAT THE APPEAL HE MADE AT THE LAST AHG BRIEFING OF THE NAC FOR EARLY ALLIED AGREEMENT ON A POSITION ON FLANK SECURITY. HE NOTED THAT WORK IN THE SPC ON THIS ISSUE IS PRESENTLY STALEMATED OVER THE CHOICE BETWEEN THE WORDS "CIRCUMVENT" OR "FRUSTRATE". THIS IS MORE THAN A SEMANTIC QUESTION, BUT TOUCHES ON THE QUESTION OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY FOR ALL ALLIES. THE ALLIES CANNOT DISCRIMINATE AMONG REGIONS BY USING ONE WORD FOR FLANK SECURITY AND A DIFFERENT WORD FOR NON-CIRCUMVENTION. (SEE SEPTEL ON JUNE 5 SPC DISCUSSION OF FLANK SECURITY.)

19. TALIANI REPLIED THAT ERALP'S REMARK CONCERNED WORK IN BRUSSELS RATHER THAN WORK IN AHG. THE AHG WOULD WELCOME NAC GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY. BUT FROM A TACTICAL NEGOTIATING STANDPOINT, THERE WAS NO GREAT URGENCY. CATALANO (ITALY) SAID HE WAS PLEASED TO HEAR THAT GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY WAS NOT URGENT FROM VIENNA STANDPOINT. HE SAID HE WANTED TO REMIND THE NAC THAT THE SPC IS CLOSE TO AGREEMENT ON GUIDANCE TO AHG ON FLANK SECURITY, AND THAT ONLY ONE DELEGATION IS NOT IN AGREEMENT. . (COMMENT: CATALANO WAS

REFERRING TO RUEKISH DELEGATION).

20. NAC AGREED TO THE DAT SUGGESTED BY AHG, JUNE 27, FOR NEXT  
AHG BRIEFING OF THE NAC.  
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 06 JUN 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO03154  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750698/abbrzkkn.tel  
**Line Count:** 278  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. MBFR VIENNA 255 B. USNATO 1555 DTG 201735Z MAR 75 C. USNATO 1705 271720Z MAR 75  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: AHG BRIEFING OF THE NAC ON JUNE 6  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** SCSTATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006